

THOMAS W. FERRELL, ESQ. (Bar No. 115605)  
 tferrell@higglaw.com  
 CHARLES F. REIDELBACH, JR., ESQ.  
 (Bar No. 167482)  
 reidelbach@higglaw.com  
 HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP  
 401 West "A" Street, Suite 2600  
 San Diego, CA 92101-7913  
 TEL: 619.236.1551  
 FAX: 619.696.1410

MARK G. KACHIGIAN (OK Bar No. 4852)  
 mkachigian@hjkllaw.com  
 CASSANDRA L. WILKINSON  
 (OK Bar No. 20368)  
 cwilkinson@hjkllaw.com  
 HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN, P.C.  
 228 West 17th Place  
 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119  
 TEL: 918.587.2000  
 FAX: 918.584.1718

Attorneys for Defendants  
 Global Machinery Company,  
 GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation Pty. Ltd.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of  
 SORENSEN RESEARCH AND  
 DEVELOPMENT TRUST,

Plaintiff,

v.

GLOBAL MACHINERY COMPANY, an  
 Australian company; GMCA PTY. LTD., an  
 Australian company; TRAPONE  
 CORPORATION PTY. LTD., an Australian  
 company; and DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 08 CV 0233

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
 MOTION FOR STAY PENDING PATENT  
 REEXAMINATION**

DATE: \*\*  
 TIME: \*\*  
 Courtroom 15, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz

No Oral Argument Unless  
 Requested by the Court

Notice of Motion and Motion for  
 Stay Pending Patent Reexamination  
 filed concurrently herewith

Defendants Global Machinery Company, GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation Pty.  
 Ltd. ("Defendants"), in support of their Motion for Stay Pending Patent Reexamination, state as  
 follows:

## BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Jens Erik Sorensen, as Trustee of Sorensen Research and Development Trust (“Plaintiff”) filed the present action against Defendants on February 5, 2008, alleging infringement of U.S. Patent Number 4,935,184 (“the ‘184 patent”). The only pending deadline in the action is the answer date, and no discovery requests have yet been issued.

The ‘184 patent is currently the subject of two reexamination proceedings before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”): reexamination application number 90/008,975 and reexamination application number 90/008,776. Many issues in this case may be clarified, simplified, and determined by the pending reexamination proceedings. A reexamination proceeding is an administrative proceeding of the USPTO. As such, the pending reexamination proceedings allow the USPTO the opportunity to resolve validity issues concerning the ‘184 patent through established administrative procedures, thus sparing this Court the burden of determining difficult patent issues. The outcome of the currently pending reexamination proceedings bears directly on the validity, enforceability, and scope of the ‘184 patent, which is the subject of the present action. In fact, should the USPTO determine that the patent is invalid, the reexamination proceedings will eliminate the need for this litigation.

Plaintiff has filed numerous lawsuits against other parties alleging infringement of the ‘184 patent, many of which lawsuits are currently pending before this Court. This Court has issued stays in three of those cases: *Sorensen v. Black and Decker Corporation*, case no. 06cv1572; *Sorensen v. Giant International (USA) Ltd.*, case no. 07cv2121; and *Sorensen v. Helen of Troy and OXO International Ltd.*, case no. 07cv2278. The reasons for staying those cases are equally applicable in the present action. Furthermore, granting a stay in the present action promotes consistency among the related cases. For the reasons expressed by this Court in its Order, docket no. 243, in *Sorensen v. Black and Decker Corporation*, case no. 06cv1572, and for the reasons stated below, a stay of the present action pending reexamination of the ‘184 patent is appropriate and warranted.

## ARGUMENT & AUTHORITIES

It is within this Court’s discretion to grant a stay of the present action. See *Ethicon, Inc. v.*

1 *Quigg*, 849 F.2d 1422, 1426-27 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As stated by the Supreme Court,  
 2 the power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in  
 3 every court to control the disposition of the cases on its docket with  
 4 economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.  
 5 How this can best be done calls for the exercise of judgment, which  
 6 must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.

7 *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936). See also *Fisher Controls*  
 8 *Company, Inc. v. Control Components, Inc.*, 443 F.Supp. 581, 581, 196 USPQ 817 (S.D. Iowa  
 9 1977) (“The district court’s power to stay proceedings has been drawn purposefully broad and is  
 10 discretionary”). Specifically, numerous courts have exercised their discretion to grant stays in  
 11 patent cases pending the resolution of a reexamination application. See, e.g., *MercExchange,*  
 12 *LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 500 F.Supp.2d 556, 562-64 (E.D. Va. 2007); *eSoft, Inc. v. Blue Coast Systems,*  
 13 *Inc.*, 505 F.Supp.2d 784 (D.Colo. 2007); *Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Upsher-Smith*  
 14 *Laboratories, Inc.*, 486 F.Supp.2d 990 (D. Ariz. 2007); *In re Cygnus Telecommunications*  
 15 *Technology, LLC, Patent Litigation*, 385 F.Supp.2d 1022 (N.D. Cal. 2006); *Lentek International,*  
 16 *Inc. v. Sharper Image Corp.*, 169 F.Supp.2d 1360 (M.D. Fla. 2001); *ASCII Corp. v. STD*  
 17 *Entertainment USA, Inc.*, 844 F.Supp. 1378 (N.D. Cal. 1994); *Gould v. Control Laser Corp.*, 705  
 18 F.2d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

19 Generally, courts often consider three factors in determining whether to grant a stay in a  
 20 patent case: “(1) whether a stay would unduly prejudice the nonmoving party or present a clear  
 21 tactical advantage for the moving party, (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues, and (3)  
 22 whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set.” *In re Laughlin Products,*  
 23 *Inc.*, 265 F.Supp.2d 525, 531 (E.D. Penn. 2003), citing *Xerox Corp. v. 3Com Corp.*, 69 F.Supp.2d  
 24 404, 406 (W.D.N.Y. 1999). In the present action, all three of these factors weigh in favor of  
 25 granting a stay. Given the early stage of the litigation, neither party will suffer undue prejudice  
 26 due to a stay. In particular, Plaintiff is in no danger of undue prejudice as the ‘184 patent has  
 27 already expired. Therefore, injunctive relief is not available and there will be no additional  
 28 damages accruing pending reexamination. Furthermore, neither party will receive a clear tactical  
 advantage. The only advantage to anyone gained by staying the present action pending the

1 reexamination prosecution will be the narrowing of the issues to be determined by this Court, an  
 2 advantage that will benefit Plaintiff, Defendants, and this Court alike. Therefore, the first factor  
 3 weighs in favor of granting a stay. Likewise, the third factor weighs in favor of granting a stay,  
 4 as discovery is not complete and a trial date has not been set. In fact, there has not been any  
 5 discovery. Most importantly, the second factor, whether a stay will simplify the issues, weighs in  
 6 favor of granting a stay, as explained below.

7 The role of the USPTO is to grant and issue patents and trademarks. 35 USC § 2.  
 8 Specifically, the USPTO is charged with examining applications for patents and determining  
 9 whether an applicant is entitled to a patent. 35 USC § 131. As such, the USPTO is in a better  
 10 position than this Court to evaluate the validity of the claims of the '184 patent. See *In re*  
 11 *Laughlin Products, Inc.*, 265 F.Supp.2d at 531 ("the PTO is in a better position than the Court to  
 12 evaluate the validity of the ['333] patent in view of the prior art references", quoting *Brown v.*  
 13 *Shimano American Corp.*, 1991 WL 133586, \*1 (C.D. Cal. 1991)).

14 As several courts have noted, there are a number of advantages to staying litigation while  
 15 a patent that is the subject of the litigation is reexamined by the USPTO:

- 16 1. All prior art presented to the Court will have been first considered by the PTO,  
 17 with its particular expertise.
- 18
- 19 2. Many discovery problems relating to prior art can be alleviated by the PTO  
 20 examination.
- 21
- 22 3. In those cases resulting in effective invalidity of the patent, the suit will likely be  
 23 dismissed.
- 24
- 25 4. The outcome of the reexamination may encourage a settlement without the further  
 26 use of the Court.
- 27
- 28 5. The record of reexamination would likely be entered at trial, thereby reducing the

1 complexity and length of the litigation.

2  
3 6. Issues, defenses, and evidence will be more easily limited in pre-trial conferences  
4 after a reexamination.

5  
6 7. The cost will likely be reduced both for the parties and the Court.  
7

8 *Fisher Controls Company, Inc.*, 443 F.Supp. at 582. See also *Datatrans Corp. v. Wells*  
9 *Fargo & Co.*, 490 F.Supp.2d 749, 754 (E.D. Tex. 2006); *GPAC, Inc. v. D.W.W. Enterprises, Inc.*,  
10 144 FRD 60, 63 (D.N.J. 1992). These advantages are equally applicable in the present case.  
11 Staying the present action until the USPTO has had a chance to prosecute the reexamination  
12 applications will simplify the issues before this Court, possibly significantly. In fact, should the  
13 USPTO determine that the '184 patent is invalid, there will be no need for further litigation.  
14 Therefore, the interests of judicial economy weigh in favor of staying this action.

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28 ///

1 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court stay Case No. 08  
2 CV 233 until the United States Patent and Trademark Office completes its reexamination of the  
3 '814 patent.

4  
5 DATED: March 17, 2008

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP

6  
7 By:   
8 THOMAS W. FERRELL, ESQ.  
9 CHARLES F. REIDELBACH, JR., ESQ.  
10 Attorneys for Defendants  
11 Global Machinery Company,  
12 GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation  
13 Pty. Ltd.

14  
15 DATED: March \_\_\_\_\_, 2008

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN, P.C.

16  
17 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
18 MARK G. KACHIGIAN  
19 Attorneys for Defendants  
20 Global Machinery Company,  
21 GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation  
22 Pty. Ltd.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28